

Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe

APPLICANT'S INTRODUCTION TO DEADLINE 8 SUBMISSION & APPLICANT RESPONSE TO INTERESTED PARTIES' DEADLINE 7 SUBMISSIONS

DEADLINE 8

Revision: Deadline8 Regulation No: **APFP** Reg:5(2)(q)

PINS Reference: EN010101

Author: Pegasus Group October 2021 Date:



Our Ref. P17-0718 PINS Ref. EN101010

1 October 2021

Louise Evans
Case Manager
National Infrastructure Planning
The Planning Inspectorate
Major Applications and Plans Directorate
Temple Quay House
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Louise

<u>Planning Act 2008 – Application for Development Consent Order</u>

<u>Application by INRG Solar (Little Crow) Limited ("the Applicant") for an Order</u>

<u>Granting Development Consent for the Little Crow Solar Park Order</u>

Deadline 8 Submission

We refer to the updated Examination Timetable and procedure letter (Rule 8(3)) issued by the Examining Authority on 7 September 2021. In accordance with the examination timetable, we submit the following documentation for the Applicant for Deadline 8: -

- 1. Applicant's Introduction to Deadline 8 Submission & Applicant Response to Interested Parties' Deadline 7 submission (this cover letter)
 - (Document Reference 9.49 LC OTH)
- 2. Application Index
 - o (Document Reference 1.2J LC APP Revision J)
- 3. A signed copy of the Statement of Common Ground with Northern Powergrid
 - (Document Reference 9.12B LC OTH)
- 4. Statement of Commonality for Statements of Common Ground
 - (Document Reference 9.22F LC OTH Revision F)

Updated Application Index

All the above documents are referenced in the accompanying updated Application Index (Document Reference 1.2J LC APP – Revision J). Within the updated Application Index, new or updated documents submitted at Deadline 8 are shown in red. Superseded

First Floor, South Wing, Equinox North, Great Park Road, Almondsbury, Bristol, BS32 4QL T: 01454 625945 | www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | Dublin | East Midlands | Edinburgh | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester | Newcastle | Peterborough | Solent

DESIGN DENVIRONMENT PLANNING DECONOMICS HERITAGE

documents are identified with a strikethrough (strikethrough).

Northern Powergrid

Further to the Applicant's Deadline 7 submission the statement of common ground with Northern Powergrid has now been agreed and is submitted at Deadline 8. The Applicant has also updated the Statement of Commonality to reflect this agreement.

Applicant's response to Sills and Betteridge LLP response to ExQ4 on behalf of Infocus ID LTD, Fenswood Motors Ltd, ManDown Support Ltd, Richard Fenwick Johnson and Katie Teresa Holme

The Applicant's response to the matters put forward by Heron's Lodge/Fennswood with regards to the ExQ4 (PINS reference REP7-014) are as follows. The Applicant's response follows the subheadings used by Sills and Betteridge.

Firstly, the Applicant notes that Sills and Betteridge have only submitted representations on draft EN-1, which provide a list of generic impacts that may be relevant to all types of energy projects. Sills & Betteridge have failed to consider draft EN-3, which now provides solar specific advice on the way these general impacts arise or are to be considered in the context of technology specific applications. The Applicant's response to draft EN-3 was provided at Deadline 7 - **Applicant's Response to ExQ4** (Document Reference 9.47 LC OTH, PINS reference REP7-010).

The implication of Consultation Versions for reviewed energy National Policy Statements

Applicant's position on this matter is set out in the **Applicant's Response to ExQ4** at Deadline 7 (Document Reference 9.47 LC OTH, PINS reference REP7-010) (paragraphs 2.3 to 2.5).

Increased regard for the impact of "Good design"

The representation makes reference to 'new text' introduced by paragraph 4.6.2 regarding how good design should be applied early in the project lifecycle. The Applicant has responded to this in its answer to ExQ4 - **Applicant's Response to ExQ4** (Document

Reference 9.47 LC OTH, PINS reference REP7-010) (paragraphs 2.12). Examples of changes that were made to the proposals during the design evolution process were also explained in the **Applicant's Post-Hearing Submissions on ISH1** submitted at Deadline 1. (Document Ref 9.17 LV OTH, PINS Reference REP1-008).

With regards to the representation signpost to paragraph 4.6.4, the Environmental Statement (various chapters) duly sets out how the candidate design was led by the environmentally informed decisions contained in the various technical chapters, this included matters pertaining to landscape, ecology, noise, heritage, archaeological and soil quality.

Landscape and Visual

The representation moves to signpost paragraph 5.10.8 and the need to consider 'noise and light pollution from construction and operational activities on residential amenity...'. These matters have already been assessed through the application submission, for example reference is made to the updated Noise Impact Assessment (Document Reference 7.16A LC TA4.9, PINS Reference REP2-014). The Outline CEMP sets out the construction principles with regards to the control of lighting (Document Reference 7.8D LC TA4.1, PINS reference REP6-006).

The representation refers to paragraph 5.11.8, the thrust of this paragraph remains unchanged from the current EN-1 (paragraph 5.10.8), new wording is introduced to encourage applicants to develop and implement a Soil Management Plan. This is already provided in the application submission, please refer to Outline Soil Management Plan (Document reference 7.11 LC TA4.4, PINS reference APP-080).

The representation then signposts paragraph 5.11.3. The Applicant notes that this paragraph remains unchanged from the current EN-1 (paragraph 5.10.3). The representation has also misapplied the paragraph. They have failed to identify how the paragraph duly acknowledges that 'it may not be possible for many forms of energy infrastructure' to use previously developed land.

The representation then signposts paragraph 5.11.14. The Applicant notes that the policy set out in this paragraph remains unchanged from the current EN-1 (paragraph 5.10.15).

The Applicant has previously provided justification regarding the use of agricultural land and this includes it response to questions from the ExA. These include:

- Table 10.10 in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement (APP-067) sets out the agricultural land classification distribution across the site. This notes that only 16.3% of the Order Limits represents Grade 3a land, with the remainder being Grade 3b or non-agricultural land.
- Paragraphs 5.55-5.59 of the Applicant's Planning Statement (Document reference 9.1A LC OTH, PINS reference REP5-017)
- The Applicant's response to ExAQ1 (REP2-022) question 1.1.8
- The Applicant's response to Relevant Representations (REP1-009, see response to RR-006) which sets out the Applicant's position on the availability of previously developed land. Attention is also drawn to North Lincolnshire Council's response to ExAQ1 (REP2-027) question 1.1.8 which is supportive of the Applicant's conclusions.

Noise and Vibration

For noise and vibration, the representation signposts paragraph 5.12.1; 5.13.3; and, 5.12.6. The policy advice set out in these paragraphs remain unchanged from the current EN-1.

For example, the signposted paragraph 5.12.6 in the Draft EN-1 is identical to paragraph 5.11.5 of the current EN-1. As stated in Paragraph 5.12.1 of the Draft EN-1, the Noise Policy Statement for England, 2010 (NPSE) still sets out the Government's policies on noise. This indicates that the general requirements for noise and vibration assessment also remain unchanged.

Of particular relevance is paragraph 5.12.7 of the Draft EN-1 (paragraph 5.11.6 of the current EN-1), which states that relevant British Standards should be used for the prediction and assessment of operational and construction noise. This is entirely the approach taken in the Noise Impact Assessment (Document Ref 7.16 LC TA4.9).

Further, the aims of the Noise Impact Assessment and mitigation measures recommended therein was to ensure there is no significant impact on the amenity of sensitive receptors. This is in accordance with one of the three 'Noise Policy Aims' as stated in the NPSE.

In summary, there are no material changes to the policy advice in the signposted paragraphs, between the current and Draft EN-1. In any case, the Noise Impact Assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the EN-1, the NPSE and relevant British Standards.





Gareth Roberts
Director
e-mail: @pegasusgroup.co.uk

